

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed via
EFS-Web with the United States Patent and Trademark Office

on 26 March 2008

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP

By: Malinda Ogil

PATENT

Attorney Docket No.: 020130-000112US

Client Ref. No.: MJP0011(US)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

WANG et al.

Application No.: 10/821,583

Filed: April 9, 2004

For: IMPROVED NUCLEIC ACID
MODIFYING ENZYMES

Customer No.: 20350

Confirmation No. 1973

Examiner: Richard G. Hutson

Technology Center/Art Unit: 1652

RESPONSE TO PROVIDE OMISSION

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This paper is submitted in response to the Office communication mailed February 26, 2008 alleging that Applicants' response filed November 28, 2007 was not fully responsive because of an omission in addressing the double patenting rejection. The Office Communication is requiring supplying the omission.

It is Applicants' understanding that the Office communication is asking that Applicants submit the omitted material only in this response. Therefore this paper addresses only the obviousness-type double-patenting rejection, which is actually a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection, set forth in the previous Office Action. Applicants request that the response filed November 28, 2007 be entered and fully considered.